COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XIII. No. 25.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 1808. [PRICE 10D.

"Give the people something to fight for, and you need have recourse to no coercive means to make them "fight."—SIR FRANCIS BURDETT'S Speech upon the Local Militia Bill.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

SPAIN.——The news from Spain is, I am afraid, too good to be true; but, if it be true; if the people are really making a stand against France, it is a most glorious circumstance, and is a fine illustration of Sir Francis Burdett's doctrine, that the people need never be *compelled* to fight; need never be *driven* to take up arms; need never be flogged to the work, provided they feel, that the cause is their own. Not a hand was raised to defend the authority of either the king or the prince; but, the moment they were safely gone, the people appear to have felt a return of their ancient character, and a desire to be great and free. The "accursed thing was "removed from the camp," and the happy effects were speedily experienced. It will, indeed, be an interesting event, if the Spaniards, with an abdicated throne, should rescue their country from the fangs of the French; or, if they should make any thing like a respectable stand against them; and, the thing is possible; for, though an immense army will be poured in upon them, a nation so populous and so large as Spain is not very soon over-run. To get rid of Napoleon and of their own stupid tyrants too will, indeed, be a glorious atchievement; but, I am afraid, it is something too glorious to hope for.——Our ministers seem to be using great promptitude in giving them assistance. I hope, that no vile miscreant will whisper in their ear, that they ought to be cautious; that this is not the cause of kings; and, that it is better to suffer Napoleon to triumph than to let the world see, that the people of any country are adequate to their own defence. I hope that no vile selfish miscreant will give such advice; but, really, I have my fears, that, when time has been taken for canvassing the subject, to reflect on the probable consequences of giving liberty to the people of Spain, or, of aiding them in the undertaking of reviving their liberties; I really have my fears, that when time has been taken for this, we shall preceive an abatement of that zeal, which, at present, appears to be operating in their behalf. I know, that there are men, who, though they hate Napoleon, because they are afraid of him, would see him conquer and enslave the people of Spain, rather than see that people free. With such persons there is nothing so formidable, nothing so horrible, nothing so diabolical, as freedom enjoyed by the people. To them, Napoleon is an object of hatred, not as an enslaver of nations, but as an overturner of authorities and a plunderer of the rich. If they lose their power of living upon the labour of the people, that is all they dread; and, as there is a chance of their enjoying their plunder under Napoleon, they would, upon all occasions, prefer his sway to such a revolution as should effectually protect the people against all plunderings whatsoever. Let us hope, however, that no such miscreants will find their way to the ear of our ministers, upon this occasion; and, if they should, let us hope, that their advice will be rejected.—— To assist the people of Spain (such assistance being uncoupled with any condition as to the internal government of the country), I, for my part, would grudge nothing; and, I believe, that the whole country has the same feeling. It is certainly, if we go seriously to work, in our power to do much. We have the complete command of the sea. In Spain there are many sea-ports. We can supply the Spaniards with an abundance of arms and ammunition. We can send them artillery, and excellent artillery officers, and some good engineers. We can spare them a small army of soldiers; and, in short, we can put it in their power to beat the French. But, then, it will require great frankness on our part; and, above all, an explicit declaration, that we will, at no time and in no manner, interfere in the internal concerns of Spain; but, that the people shall be left to their own free choice as to all matters relating to their own government. This is, however, what, I am afraid, we shall not do. Any thing that we isuse will, we shall see, be filled with *reservations*, and with doctrines about *loyalty* and *religion*; and, that being the case, the Spaniards will have no confidence in us. We shall, I am afraid, talk about their king being *held in captivity*; and, if we do, the people of Spain will treat us just as the people of France did. Napoleon is become a sort of general protector of crowned heads. It is not his interest to see,

any where, a change in favour of the liberties of the people; and his interest agrees but too well, in this respect, with the inclinations of most of the governments, which he attacks, and which the people will not defend against him, merely because it is impossible for him to make their lot worse than it is.—— The COURIER newspaper tells us, that the country feels unusual anxiety for the "patriots" of Spain. This print is quite enthusiastic in their cause. I wish it may not soon receive *a damper*. I wish it may not hear a voice, saying: "What are you "about, Courier? Do you know how dan- "gerous it is to talk of *patriots?* Do you "consider that the people of Spain are acting "for their own preservation, and not for the "exclusive benefit of a base, corrupt, and "greedy set of courtiers? Do you reflect, "that, if they succeed, bribery and corrup- "tion will be starved in Spain? And, have "you duly weighed the natural consequen- "ces of an example, which would convince "the world, that a king may abdicate his "throne, that he and all his family may be "taken into exile, and that, yet, the coun- "try may be defended, its liberties restored, "and its honour and greatness asserted? "Pray, consider, what a contrast this event "will make when compared with what has "happened in those countries, where the "kings and princes have *remained*; and "where the struggle (such as it was) has "been made *for them*. In the power of "Napoleon there is, to be sure, great dan- "ger; but, my dear Courier, that power, "were it ten times as great as it is, would "not be an object of a thousandth part so "much dread, as the success of a people, "who should, at once, defend themselves "against him, and annihilate domestic bri- "bery, corruption, and oppression." It will grieve me to see this damper applied to the Courier, who, having its eye fixed upon Napoleon's power, now talks so cheerly about "the *patriots* of Spain;" but, I must confess, that I am greatly afraid of it; for, to wish success to the people of Spain is to wish destruction to bribery and sycophancy and peculation, than all which, to the heart of the Courier, nothing appears to be more congenial.——If Napoleon were baffled in Spain, there is no telling to what that might lead. The ultimate consequence might be the deliverance of Europe. I mean the "real deliverance," and not a mere exchange of despotisms. The effect in America would be wonderful; though I should be greatly surprized, if, in the United States, the go- vernment, the present reigning faction, were not decidedly hostile to the Spaniards, that faction being French at heart, and nothing but French ——There is, it is said, an envoy in London, from the Spanish patriots, the VISCOUNT MATEROSA, who has been fully accredited by our ministers; so that, it would seem, that there are occasions, when to be patriots is no sin.——All this is delightful, if we do not change our minds; but, I have great fears upon that score. I have great fears, that there are, in this country, several men, who, rather than see the Spaniards really free, would see them exterminated, and Buonaparté marching in triumph over the land stained with their blood. I will not *name* these men; but, I wish my words to be remembered, and most sincerely wish the correctness of my opinion may not become too evident, before many months have passed over our heads.——Mr. Sheridan has, I see, given notice of a motion upon the subject of Spain, which motion is to be made, it seems, to-morrow, and, as I shall not, in this sheet, have an opportunity of noticing the debate, I will here make a remark or two upon what was said relative to *the propriety of making any motion at all.* Mr. Perceval "could not see what good "could arise from the agitation of such a "subject;" and Mr. Whitbread thought, "that the moment was so critical, that "every matter of the kind should be left "entirely and exclusively to the discretion "of the *executive power*." For what? I can see no reason for that at all. Let the communication with Spain be carried on by, or through, the king; but, at the most critical of all times, shall the parliament disperse, and express not one single sentiment relative to Spain? They are allowed, God bless them, to send up to the king as many addresses as they please, upon any and upon every occasion; but, they are not to whisper a word by way of advice.——Nothing can be more proper than a resolution passed by the parliament, expressive of their joy at what is *reported* has taken place in Spain, and of their earnest hope, that no means within our power will be neglected to give success to the arms of the people of that country, so basely abandoned, so shamefully sold, by their rulers.——Into such a resolution might be wrought the sentiment of the parliament respecting the *principle* upon which aid should be afforded to the Spaniards; which would operate as a check upon those, who might be tempted to carry on war for the Spaniards, upon the vile principle that it was carried on for the royalist French.——The motion will do good, at any rate, and I do not think it is *possible* that it should do any harm. If it make the

ministers declare themselves bent upon endeavouring to give *real* freedom to the people of Spain, the declaration may tend to keep them firm; and, if it discover the fact, that the ministers are about to play the old game of Pitt and Dundas, the sooner the people of Spain know it, the better it is.—— The world, as yet, know nothing of the feeling of any part of our government, towards the cause of the Spaniards. We ourselves know nothing of it. If the news, that has been received, be true, there ought, before now, to have been a congratulation pass between the king and the parliament. Mr. Sheridan, in answer to Mr. Whitbread, said, that "he felt the urgency of the business, "and was, therefore, resolved not to leave "it to the slow and skulking hesitation of "the ministers." Nobly resolved! if you do but stick to it. A skulking hesitation, indeed! What should have prevented them from declaring their intentions before now? What danger could there possibly have been in their avowing themselves the friends of the people of Spain? It appears to me to be one of those cases, in which disguise could not possibly be of any service, supposing the views of the ministers to have been what they ought.——We ask them to divulge no secrets. We do not ask them how, or when, they are going to aid the Spaniards. All we want to know, is, that they heartily wish success to *the people* of Spain. We want to be assured, that there are no lurking stipulations about *royalty* in contemplation; no design whatever to seize upon the treasures of Spain; and, in spite of all they can do, Mr. Sheridan's motion will bring forth that which will discover their intentions in the gross.

Cow-Pox.——This experiment, which has cost the nation twenty thousand pounds, or more, to Dr. Jenner, is now, it seems, to have an act of parliament to give it currency. Mr. Rose has brought in a bill for the purpose of "establishing a central institution "in London for the distribution of the cow-"pox matter," which bill, in all appearance, will pass; and thus this disgusting and degrading remedy will cost the nation another four or five thousand pounds annually, though it has been clearly proved not to have answered the purpose intended. This, however, I regard as cheap, when compared to the menace of Mr. Fuller, who, in a late debate proposed a *compulsory* law upon the subject. He took up the old idea of Mr. Wilberforce, who was for a law to prevent parents from having their children inoculated with the small pox matter, unless they chose to send them to pest-houses, or to some place at a considerable distance from any other habitations. This cruel and tyrannical proposition I opposed at the time; and I am happy to perceive, that it is now universally exploded, except by the deluded few, who have been weak enough to enrol themselves in a sort of combination in favour of the cow-matter.——I should like to have heard Mr. Rose's statement of the circumstances at Ringwood, whence, he says, it is evident, that the failure arose "from "the use of *improper matter*." That many persons, who had been inoculated with the cow-pox, caught the small pox, and died, at Ringwood, is a fact that even "*the Royal* "*Jennerian Society*" cannot deny; and, this being the case, what man, in his senses, will put any faith in the efficacy of the cow-pox, as a preventive of the small pox? The thing is done. It *has failed*, and it is in vain to endeavour to prop up its reputation; for, in a few years, it will become proverbial as a humbug.——The pretext of *spurious matter* is the weakest defence that ever was set up; because, it is evident, that such will always be the excuse. The methodist pike, who told his shoal of gudgeons, that, *if they had faith*, they might jump into a chalk pit without so much as straining their ancles, answered all their reproaches with saying, that their broken bones were owing to their own sin in not having faith, and referred, for proof, to one amongst them, who had accidentally escaped unhurt. All that catch the small pox and die, have been cow-poxed with spurious matter, and all who have not yet caught the small pox, after the cow pox operation, have had the pure matter; and so it will be, to be sure, to the end of the chapter ——*Who* is to collect this "genuine matter", and *whence* is it to come? Who shall tell whether he inoculate with the cow-pox or with king's evil? Or with many other disorders, one of which I will not name, but which I do hope, that fathers and mothers, who have given their children that greatest of blessings, a pure stream of blood, will not forget, when they are about to cause that blood to be impregnated with matter taken from the ulcerous bodies of others. The small pox is liable to no such fatal consequence. The disorder is so well known as never to be mistaken; and, as to the *risk*, what is a little risk of *death*, compared with a great risk of that which must render life a continual burden?——I am glad, however, to perceive, that the ministers took care to intimate their decided hostility to any law for propagating the cow-pox by *force*, by the aid of *pains* and *penalties*. This being the case, I care little about Mr.

Rose and his cow pox institution. Those, who choose to have their children's blood impregnated from that shop, will be at liberty so to do; and those who wish to avoid it, may. This is all right; though it may be very foolish indeed to make laws upon such a subject. I think, we may thank the events at Kingwood for this ministerial protest against compulsory measures. It would have been curious enough to see people paying penalties for being so obstinate as not to consult their own health, or that of their children!——The present application to parliament is a pretty good proof, that the project is beginning to be blowed upon. "The *Royal* Jennerian Society" *want funds*. The subscribers have fallen off; and so application to the public purse is become necessary. *Why* have the subscribers fallen off? Their *humanity* has not waxed cold, to be sure. It were slander, indeed, to suppose that. But, I suspect, that their *faith* has waxed cold; and, when that is the case, zeal soon slackens its operations, more especially when those operations consist chiefly in the expenditure of money.——Some persons will, perhaps, blame me for thus exciting alarm in the minds of parents; who have applied the cow-pox to their children. But, they who are *really* alarmed, will perceive that the remedy is at hand, and will not fail to apply it; and, besides, it is for me to look to the future as well as to the past.

POST-CHAISE WORK.——This seems an odd title to an article under the head of *politics*; but, it will be found, I think, that certain proceedings, relative to the price of posting, involve principles of great moment, in politics. The reader will have observed, that, for sometime past, there has been an advertisement in the news-papers, purporting, that certain "*Noblemen* and *Gentlemen*" met occasionally, at the St. Albans Tavern, for the purpose of concerting measures *to keep down the price of posting*.——I was, when I first saw this advertisement, tempted to notice it; and, I cannot now delay to do it, seeing what has passed, upon the subject, in the House of Commons.——On the tenth instant, "Mr. Sheridan rose pursuant to notice, to move for leave to bring in a bill to amend the acts relating to licences. His object, was to make it obligatory on the magistrates to assign a reason whenever they took away a licence, or refused to grant one. He adverted to the recent meetings of members of both houses of parliament, at the St. Albans Coffee-house, with a view to prevent the rise in the price of postage; and the remedy proposed by the member for Sussex, by the refusal of a licence on the part of the magistrates, to any innkeeper raising the price of postage. He moved for leave to bring in a bill to amend the act of the 32d of the king, on the subject of licences.——Mr. Fuller said, it was evident that there were many persons at the meetings at the St. Albans Tavern, who were not members of both houses of parliament, for the right hon. Gent. could have heard the statement he had just made of his proposition, only from the unfair understanding of a post-horse master looking for the high prices. What he had stated, was, that the only mode of obtaining remedy was by encouraging competition. But in cases of gross abuse in remote places, where there was no room for competition, he allowed he suggested the propriety of the magistrates taking away the licence, and he cited the precedent of a licence taken away from an Innkeeper who charged a French ambassador going out of the country, 150l. for a breakfast. It was fit the magistrates should have such a discretion in cases of gross abuse, and to subject them to assign reasons would be to subject them to the lash of the Court of King's Bench, and the recovery of penalties by the criminal publican."——As to the subject of this motion, this annual lure of Mr. Sheridan to the publicans of Westminster, it is hardly worthy of notice, there being only a few sot-pot fools in that city, who do not clearly see to the bottom of it. But, it here comes out, in the shape of an acknowledged fact, that it was suggested, by a member of parliament, to the "noblemen and gentlemen," at the St. Albans Tavern, to use their power (lodged in their hands, as magistrates) for the purpose of punishing inn-keepers, for charging them at what they deem too high a rate for carrying them about the country; to punish men for asking such or such a price for their work and the use of their chattels; and, this fact I deem a most disgraceful one to both the head and the heart of the parties proposing and entertaining the measure.—— It matters little whether the price of posting be exorbitant, or reasonable; though, from any calculation that I can make, I think it reasonable; and, my wonder always has been, how the inn-keepers, in the part of England that I am most acquainted with, can perform it at so cheap a rate as they do. The proof that it *cannot* be performed cheaper, leaving a proper profit to the innkeeper, is that it *is not* performed cheaper; for, if a larger profit were derived from

capital employed in posting, than from capital employed in any other way, the certain consequence would be, that *more* capital would flow into the posting trade, and thus would the profits of that trade be speedily reduced to the general level of the profits of other trades. If the rise, which is now contemplated, or which has taken place in the rate of posting, leave the inn-keeper a greater profit than can be acquired from the selling of plumbs and sugar and candles, for instance, do the St. Albans wiseacres suppose that there will be no grocers that will turn inn-keepers? Do they suppose, sensible "noblemen and "gentlemen," that nobody will be tempted to get a share of these immense profits; and, that the present inn-keepers will continue in the enjoyment of a monopoly of gain, when that gain is open to all the world? Do they suppose, cunning "noblemen and gentlemen," that the whole of the people, having capital to employ, will be blind to these enormous profits, or that there is some unknown cause which will arrest capital in its natural current towards this particular calling? Mr. Fuller says, indeed, that the best remedy is "*the en-*"*couraging of competition;*" but, as he did not point out the best *mode* of doing that, I will for him, and that is, by giving some one *more than the present inn-keeper demands*. If he tell me, that the remedy would then be worse than the disease, my answer is, that, from the very nature of things, it must be the only way of *encouraging* a competition. Let us try this empty talk by the test of practice. Suppose Mr. Fuller, together with all the noblemen and gentlemen in the county of Sussex, were to set about their remedy, as far as applied to the road from Chichester to London. How would they go to work? *How* would they *encourage* competition? It is easy to talk about it, but how would they *do* it? Why, to be sure, in this way: they would ride in the chaises of those who would convey them at a cheaper rate than that at which the present inn-keepers will convey them. So that, incomparable conjurers, they would *encourage* capital to come into the posting trade by offering it a profit *less* than that, which now exists, which does not induce it to come of its own accord, and which they, by their very talk of *encouragement*, acknowledge to be insufficient to induce it to come. Most people, when they have a desire to bring additional labour to a particular point, or to draw additional capital to any particular business, offer *greater* wages and *greater* profits than were before given or derived; but, this new set of coalesced conjurers, act upon a principle precisely the contrary, and yet, they talk as gravely about their schemes as if they were founded in nature and in reason, and as if they would, as a thing of course, receive the assent of the public in general. But, great self conceit is a never-failing characteristic of imbecility of mind. What do these "noblemen and "gentlemen," what does Mr. Fuller, for instance, imagine that post-horse keepers should see in his face, to induce them to employ a losing or a dead capital in drawing his body about the country? It is not, good man, for the *honour*, but for the *profit* of your custom, that they bow and scrape and smile and cringe and run and bawl at your approach. About *you* they care no more than they do about the dirt upon your boots. It is your *money* that they have a respect and an affection for; and, if you should attempt to carry your encouraging project into practice, the first question that will be asked you will be, what money you will advance for the purpose; what *addition* you will make to the rate of posting at which the present inn-keepers carry you; how much you will give *more* than is given by other people?——Will you build new inns for the purpose of encouragement? Do, and let them for a fourth part of what they cost you; and even then your purpose would not be effected. You would, probably, be carried three pence a mile cheaper than by the old inn-keepers; but, my good Mr. Fuller, there is a difference in the *quality* of posting, as well as in the quality of beer. The brewer, if you compel him to sell his beer at three pence a pot will get just as much profit as he does when he sells it at six pence a pot. Water costs him nothing; with this he lowers his beer to the price that he gets for it. *Time* is the great ingredient in the hands of the posting trade, and that, were they stinted in their price, they must, and would, call to their aid. From seven miles an hour they would come down to five; instead of a neat tight chaise, you would have to commit your person to an old rattling, jingling, crazy thing, that might let you drop upon the side of that break-neck hill between Midhurst and Haslemere, which, to say nothing of the hindrance and injury that the affairs of the nation and of the cow pox matter society might experience, would far outweigh the amount of the few additional pounds which you lay out, during the year, in expeditious and safe posting.——If any one can doubt that such would be the effect

of an "*encouragement*" such as Mr. Fuller proposes, he has only to travel, for a few days, in those parts of the country, where the inn-keepers have few post-chaise customers. Here, the price is the same as upon the great roads; but, from the want of constant employment for the horses, drivers, and chaises, all these the owner is obliged to keep of an inferior quality; the consequence of which is, that travelling is much slower, much less comfortable, and much more dangerous. Ten times for every mile-stone are the landlord, the driver, the chaise, and the poor horses abused; but, if the traveller would but take one moment to reflect, he would clearly perceive, that the fault was the want of a price sufficiently high to enable the former to provide and keep all the latter of a better quality.—— So that, it appears to me, that, if the office of a justice of the peace could be perverted to the base purpose of extorting from the inn-keepers a part of the money due to them for their posting-work, they would very soon right themselves by *lowering the quality* of their commodity. Therefore, the only *practicable* scheme seems to be this: for the justices of each district to insist upon having *their own* posting done at a cheap rate, and to leave the inn keepers to get as much as they can from every body else. This would be very rascally; it would be an infamous abuse of power; and, it is, I am persuaded, what very few justices of the peace would be guilty of, if they could with impunity. But, it is what might be done; it is practicable; there is sense in it; while, in the other scheme, there is nothing but what is senseless; nothing but what must have issued from a head without brains, or whatever else it is that enables the owner to reflect and to reason.——The power given to the justices to refuse, to grant, or to renew, licences to public houses, was given for the purpose of being a check to *disorder* and *immorality*, and, they were to be spared the trouble and vexation of any process for having exercised this power, because, proof being so difficult to obtain, they would, if exposed to an action for their conduct, be always disinclined to do their duty in this respect. But, would it not be an abominable act, to make use of this power for the purpose of fixing a maximum upon the work of post-horses and drivers? For the purpose of causing themselves and their friends to be carried about the country at the expence of other people? It is sufficient to state the proposition to expose it to universal reprobation.——As to the meeting at the St. Albans, too, does it not furnish a very decent example? Will these "noblemen "and gentlemen" attempt to shoot deluded people, if, upon any future occasion, they should meet for the purpose of fixing a maximum upon bread or meat? Bread and meat are full as necessary to them as posting is to these "noblemen and gentlemen," and the inn-keeper has as good a right to fix his price, to ask what he thinks the worth of his commodity, as the baker and butcher have to ask what they think the worth of theirs. It would be curious enough to hear a man, upon his trial for a riot, justify himself upon the example of "the noblemen and gentlemen" at the St. Albans Tavern; and, would it not, Mr. Fuller, be very hard to hang or whip the poor unfortunate brother?——It was a mercy, that some wiseacre did not propose to pass an act of parliament for keeping down the rate of posting. We should have heard of a great demand for dog-horses; for nothing else would have made its appearance before a post-chaise. There would have been quite a new system of posting regulations introduced; there would have been charges for luggage; there would have been charges for fire; there would have been something to make up for the low price of posting; or else, the chaises must have been drawn by live carrion driven by a wretch that might have been suspected of having dropped from a gibbet ——No, no; pray, Mr Fuller, let such matters alone. You may be deeply versed in what relates to the cow-pox matter, of which society, I perceive (from a letter of yours, inserted in the Morning Chronicle of the 9th instant, between an Amphitheatre and a Lottery puff), you are chosen the vice president; but, as far as I am able to judge from your proceedings at the St. Albans Tavern, your mind is unused to entertain questions relating to profits and prices. I have, for my part, always thought the lot of the innkeeper a very hard one. I supposed him, one way or another, to get money; but, then I considered what a slave he was; how he was obliged to receive every farthing of his due as a favour; what respect he was obliged to assume for thousands of persons, whom he must have despised; how submissive he was obliged to be to the humours and important airs of many, who, he must have been pretty certain, never were in a chaise before in their lives; and with what complaisance he was obliged to answer to the surly, brutish growl of many an old swoln glutton or sot, who, stripped of his wealth, must have been more disgusting than the dead dogs or cats in the kennel. A man so occupied I cannot grudge great profits. The night-

man earns, perhaps, a guinea in six hours, but, who would not rather be a carpenter at half-a-crown a day? When, therefore, Sir, your are again engaged in a calculation of the gains of the inn-keeper, pray do not forget to make a large deduction on account of his slavery.

AMERICAN STATES.——The following "toasts and sentiments, selected from va- "rious celebrations of the 4th of July, in "differents parts of the United States," I extract from an American newspaper of last year, in order to give the reader a specimen of the means that are made use of, in that country, to keep alive a hatred of England; and to enable him to judge of the probability that there is of gaining the friendship of such a people by concession and by wheedling. "The charter of our independence—the ea- "gle this day proclaims that the blot of the "Leopard upon it, shall be expiated by the "remorse or *blood of the lion.*——Great "Britain; "the voice of our brother's "blood crieth from the ground."—May that "powerful appeal to justice and vengeance "not be disregarded by any true American, "and we shall again teach those *robbers* "(like their countrymen Burgoyne and "Cornwallis) to march to the tune of Yan- "kee Doodle.——The *royal assassins* of "Britain, Whitby and Humphreys—wor- "thy servants of a worthy master; may *the "gallows brove their end*, and the execra- "tion of a free people their epitaph. —— "The memory of our gallant tars lately *as- "sassinated* on board the frigate Chesa- "peake, by the treacherous, cowardly, san- "guinary ruffians of Britain; when the ex- "ecutive gives the signal we shall be found "at our post ready to avenge their murder. "——May the heart never beat nor the "soul never feel, who would not remember "the murder of our citizens on board the "Chesapeake.——The manufactories of the "United States, we have improved beyond "our most sanguine expectation, we will "show the haughty Britons that Americans "can do better without their cloth than they "can without *our flour.*——Law; written "and plain rules for freemen, common "sense and common honesty to interpret "them, and the knife to the root of *that "hideous excrescence called common law of "England*, servilely adopted by an Ameri- "can bench."——This is the "*mild* and "*unoffending* people," of whom Mr. Senator Mitchell spoke, as the reader some time ago saw in the extract, which I made from his speech. The utmost endeavours of the ablest describer could not give us the means of judging of the temper of the Americans so well as this little extract does. This is the sort of language they have always held towards us, at times when their injustice and insolence have brought down upon them the exercise of our power; and, at other times, they have always spoken of us as a nation of the basest of cowards. So that, in their mouths, we have always been murderers or poltroons.——But, what do the vain and stupid wretches mean by murder committed by Capt. Humphreys? They talk of *treachery* too. Why, did he not send word to their commander, that, unless the men were given up, the frigate would be attacked? And was it not a frigate of 44 guns against a ship of 50 guns? Where, then, was the treachery, or the murder? We shall, by-and-by, I suppose, be told, that Lord Nelson committed horrid murder, in the bay of Trafalgar. This is the way of saucy boys: give them the horse-whip, and they stun the street with cries of murder.——The vain fools, you see, have the conceit, that we live upon "their *flour*." I have proved, that, when all the ports were open, we did not import, upon an average of years, more than enough to find us in food for *one week* in each year, supposing the corn imported to be worth (as Mr. Young states it) two millions sterling annually; and, as to the part, of these imports, that came from America, Mr. Young describes it as not being worthy of notice. His words are these: "to ex- "pect bread from America, would be to "look for it from a country whence it ne- "ver came, except in quantities perfectly "insignificant, when compared with the "magnitude of our demand." I wish the fools in America had been, in time, possessed of this truth. It certainly would have made them less insolent. Yet, it would have been very difficult to make them believe the fact. They see great numbers of barrels of flour shipped off from their several ports; and, as it is flattering to their vanity to believe, that they feed all the world; that all the nations upon earth are, in some sort, at their mercy, they would not be easily persuaded to the contrary.——Are the fools not mad? They have fallen out with the *Common Law of England!* They want "a knife to the root of this *hideous "excrescence!*" They are mad. Raving mad. Why, the foolish beasts, what law have they but the common law of England? One of the clauses in each of their written constitutions was, that "the Common Law "of England should be the Common Law of "America." Where would they, if "a "knife" were put to this "excrescence," look for *principles*, whereon to decide in

any case, either of property or of crime? They are mad.——What would become of the trial by jury and all the rights and privileges attached to it? They are mad. What pretty work it would be to lay all property at the mercy of a new set of lawgivers, appointed to form a *written code* to meet all the diversity of circumstances, which must arise in the hundreds of cases, that would, in the course of a few years, be brought forward for decision! They are stark staring mad.—— It is curious enough to observe, however, that, at the very moment, that they are representing it as a shame for a nation, so *free* as they are, to admit the use of the common law of England; while they are (as has always been their practice) speaking of themselves as the *only* free people in the world; it is curious to observe, that, while this is going forward in one column of their newspapers, they are, in another, complaining of the tyranny, under which they themselves live. The same paper, which contained the above extracts, also contained the following paragraph, relative to the conduct of MACKEAN, the Governor of Pennsylvania. ——"The protection of the laws is com- "pletely done away in regard to one party, "and as far as they can be persecuted and "hunted down by law, they are sure of be- "ing victims. Is ours a government of "*equal* laws? Is this a government of *the* "*people?* What sort of a constitution must "that be, which admits of such excuses, "and tolerates such abuses? There surely "must be something rotten at the root; "and although we may get rid of such an "excrescence as M'Kean by impeachment, "the root of the evil still will remain, and "a governor of evil propensities, may in- "flict the same wounds upon society. Is it "just, is it equitable, can it be justified by "any rational principle, that one man, one "family, or a sect of quids, should be above "the law, and that another portion of the "community should not only be subject to "its penalties, but be made the victims of "its obscurity and its tyranny? And yet "such is the present state of society.—— "M'Kean the governor of poor unfortunate "Pennsylvania, has declared, that he would "transmit the constitution unimpaired to "his successor. That constitution requires "of him, that *he shall see the laws faith-* "*fully executed*, and he is sworn to the "performance of his duty. How are the "laws executed? His son, the attorney ge- "neral, pressed the court to send for one ci- "tizen from Lancaster to answer to an in- "dictment, while he permits one of his "cronies, who has been indicted for up- "wards of six weeks, to roam at large un- "der his nose.—What a faithful executor of "our laws! How unstained and unbroken "will not the constitution descend to "M'Kean's successor! How fruitful are not "our laws of protection, and how rigour- "ously are they not made to embrace "crime! How blessed are not the people of "Pennsylvania with such a governor, such "an attorney general, such a noble family, "and such a virtuous host of officers manu- "factured in the M'Kean laboratory!"—— Well done! Out with it!—But, is this, then, the blessed effects of your written constitutions? And, yet do you want to set more pettifoggers to work to make more codes for you?——This Mackean is, to be sure, all they say of him. There was not such a man figured, even during the worst times of the French revolution. He was born to be a tyrant, of which character he has all the qualities in the highest perfection. My malediction upon the Pennsylvanians was, "may Mackean live to the age of Me- "thusalem;" and, the best of it is, that the tyrant, as if wearied of persecuting one party, has now, it appears, fallen upon, and stuck his poisonous eld fangs into, the other party, that party who were guilty of most shocking crimes in order to raise him to the Governor's chair. His principal object has been to fatten his sons and relations upon the taxes. With this in view, he turned out of place all the persons of the party at first opposed to him; but, many of the best offices being in the hands of his own party, it was next necessary to quarrel with that party, and, of course, to play off, as he now appears to be doing, the other party against them. The party last-mentioned are delighted at this opportunity of glutting their revenge: and, thus Mackean, with perfect safety, persecutes them alternately, or, rather, as the legend relates of the devil, he sits sniggering to himself, while the two gangs of sinners, whom he has set by the ears, abuse and rob and murder one another. ——The Americans are truly a miserable people. It is quite impossible for people to have a common chance of happiness amidst such continual strife; strife which is found to exist in every village, though it contain but half a dozen houses, or huts. Some pettifogger is sure to put his poisonous paw into every man's mess. The most despicable scoundrels contrive to set good neighbours at war with each other. There is no such thing as *justice* in the legal decisions, except by mere chance. Half the country is annually perjured. It is an abuse of words to talk of the *liberties* of the people, in a

country where there is no public morality. Where contracts and oaths are made but to be broken, neither property nor person can be safe.

Botley, June 16, 1808.

COBBETT'S
Parliamentary History
OF
ENGLAND.

The Fourth Volume of the above Work, comprising the Period from the Restoration in the year 1660, to the Revolution in the year 1688; will be ready for delivery on Saturday, the 25th instant.—On the same day will be published, the Tenth Volume of "Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates."

*** All communications for the "Parliamentary Debates," if sent in due time, shall be carefully attended to.

ROMAN CATHOLIC PETITION.

The following is an authentic Report of the Speech of the BISHOP OF NORWICH in the House of Lords on the 27th of May last, as it will be given in "Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates."

"My Lords;—I rise, for the first time in my life, to address your lordships, and I rise with unaffected reluctance; not because I entertain the smallest doubt, respecting either the expediency, the policy, or the justice of the measure now under consideration; but, because, to a person in my situation, it must be exceedingly painful, (however firmly persuaded he may be in his own mind) to find himself impelled by a sense of duty, to maintain an opinion, directly the reverse of which is supported by so many wise and good men who belong to the same profession, and who sit upon the same bench with him. Important occasions however, sometimes arise, on which an individual may be called upon to avow his own sentiments explicitly and unequivocally, without any due deference to the judgment of others. Such an occasion I conceive the present to be, and shall without further apology trouble your lordships with a few remarks.—I have considered, with all the care and attention, of which I am capable, the various arguments which are urged against the Petition, in favour of the Catholics of Ireland, which has, this day, for the second time, been presented and supported by the noble baron on the other side of the house, with his usual abilities, and at the same time, with that well known regard for the real interest of the Established Church, for its peace, its security, its honour, and its prosperity, which forms, and has always formed so distinguished a part in the character of that noble lord. —These objections, my lords, numerous as they are said to be, may all of them I think, be reduced under four heads. In the first place, it is asserted, or rather strongly insinuated, that the religious tenets of the Catholics, are of such a nature as, *per se*, to exclude those who hold them from the civil, and military situations, to which they aspire. It is next said, that if this were not the case, these situations are matters of favour, not of right, and therefore, the Catholics have no just cause to complain that they are excluded from them. In the third place, we are told, that if it were admitted, that the measure were, abstractedly considered, just and right; it would be highly inexpedient, to repeal statutes, which were passed with much deliberation; and are considered by many, as the bulwarks of the constitution, in church and state. And, lastly, there are some, who contend, that if there were no other objection, the words of the Coronation Oath present an insuperable bar to the claims of the Catholics. I shall not detain your lordships long in the examination of these objections, because they have been repeatedly discussed, and, as it appears to me, very satisfactorily refuted, by far abler men, both in this house and out of it.—With respect to the religious tenets of the Catholics of the present day, it is not a little singular, my lords, that we will not allow them to know what their own religious tenets really are. We call upon them for their Creed, upon some very important points: and they give it to us without reserve; but, instead of believing what they say, we refer them, with an air of controversial triumph, to the Councils of Constance, or Thoulouse, to the Fourth Lateran Council, or to the Council of Trent. In vain they most explicitly, and most solemnly aver, that they hold no tenet whatsoever, incompatible with their duties, either as men, or as subjects, or in any way hurtful to the government under which they live. In vain they publish Declaration upon Declaration, in all of which they most unequivocally disavow those highly exceptionable tenets which are imputed to them: and not only do they disavow, but they express their abhorrence of them. In vain they confirm these Declarations by an Oath—an Oath, my lords, framed by ourselves, drawn up with all possible care, and caution, and couched in terms, as strong as language affords. In addition to these ample securities,

for the principles and practice of this numerous and loyal class of our fellow subjects and fellow christians. A great statesman, now unhappily no more caused to be transmitted a string of very important Queries, to the principal Catholic Universities abroad; for the purpose of ascertaining, with precision, the sentiments of the Catholic Clergy, respecting the real nature and extent of the Papal Power, and some other weighty points. The answers returned to these Queries, by those learned bodies, appeared to me at the time, as they do now, perfectly satisfactory, and in the same light they were considered by most dispassionate men. Notwithstanding all this, a concealed jealousy of Catholics still lurks about, by far, too many of us; a jealousy in my opinion, as unworthy of a frank and enlightened people, as it is injurious and cruel towards those who are the objects of it: for surely, my lords, if there be one position more incontrovertibly true than another, it is this: if an individual, or a body of men, will give to the government under which they live such a security upon oath, as that government itself prescribes;—if, moreover, they maintain no opinions destructive of moral obligation, or subversive of civil society; their speculative opinions of a religious nature, can never, with justice or with reason, be urged as excluding them from Civil and Military situations. The Catholics, my lords, give this security; and having given it, the legislature itself has declared, that they ought to be considered "as good and loyal subjects;" as such, therefore, in my view of the subject, they are unquestionably entitled to the privileges which they claim. When I speak of merely speculative opinions of Religion, I wish to be understood as meaning such opinions as begin in the understanding, and rest there, and have no practical influence whatsoever upon our conduct in life. With this limitation, I am not sensible that there is any fallacy in the argument which I have made use of; if there be any, I shall be happy to have it pointed out; as I cannot possibly have any motive in view but what from my heart, I believe to be the truth.—Should an unfortunate and deep rooted prejudice prevail so far, as to make us say, decidedly and openly, that we will not believe a Catholic even upon his oath, there is an end, my lords, of the discussion at once; but the argument, if argument it can be called, proves a great deal too much; and for this plain reason: no obligation more binding than that of an appeal to the Supreme Being by an oath, has hitherto been devised in civil society;—he, therefore, who can justly be supposed capable of setting at nought such an obligation, upon any pretence whatsoever, is not only unworthy of the privileges here contended for, but he is unfit for all social intercourse of every kind—*Vetabo sub iisdem sit trabibus*—Harsh, and horrid, as the expression must sound in your lordships ears, he ought to be exterminated from the face of the earth; or at least he should be banished for life to Botany Bay; and even when arrived there he should be driven back into the sea;—for there is no den of thieves, no gang of robbers, no banditti so thoroughly profligate, and at the same time so devoid of common understanding, as to admit that man a member of their community, upon whose fidelity to his engagements no reliance can be placed even for a single hour.—I come now to the second Objection; my answer to which will be very short. Civil and Military Appointments, are it seems, matters of favour, not of right, and therefore the Catholics have no just cause to complain that they are excluded from them. I can hardly, my lords, conceive any man in earnest who regards this distinction as applicable to the present case, because no one pleads for an abstract right to these situations, but for a capacity of holding them: no one contends for the absolute possession of civil, and military offices, but for equal eligibility to them, and having endeavoured to prove, that all men are equally eligible, who give to the government under which they live, such a security, upon oath, for their conduct as subjects, as that government itself prescribes, and who maintain no opinions destructive of moral obligation or subversive of civil society, I shall only add here, that they are so considered to be, in almost all the governments of Europe and over the whole continent of America: and I should be sorry to see England the last to follow so good an example. "But it is inexpedient," we are told, "to repeal statutes, which "were passed with much deliberation, and "are considered by many as the bulwarks "of the constitution in church and state." How long, my lords, it may be thought expedient, or necessary, that the remaining part of these restrictive disqualifying statutes should be enforced against the catholics, or at what precise period their operation shall end, is a question not for a divine, but for statesmen and lawyers to decide. I may however be permitted to observe, that under any government, however free, though peculiar circumstances may perhaps call for statutes of a very strict, and even of a very severe nature, for a limited period of time, yet no wise statesman would, I

imagine, wish those statutes to remain unrepealed, a moment after the circumstances which occasioned them cease to exist. Those who are acquainted with the history of the statutes here alluded to, and of the times, in which they passed, will anticipate my application of this remark: the application of it is indeed, made for me, by a very eminent lawyer, and a very cordial friend to the Ecclesiastical, as well as to the Civil Constitution of this realm. This able writer observes, more than once in his Commentaries, that "whenever the period shall arrive, when "the power of the Pope is weak and insignificant, and there is no Pretender to the "throne, that then will be the time to grant "full indulgence to the catholics." That time, my lords, is now come; there is no Pretender to the throne; and with respect to the Papal Power, not a single person present, apprehends, I am thoroughly persuaded, any danger from it;—in truth that once gigantic power—*magni stat nominis umbra*—and nothing more. Where, then, can be the objection to granting the Petition of the Catholics of Ireland? A Petition founded on the immutable principles of reason and of justice; a Petition also which worldly policy loudly calls upon us to accede to in the present very serious crisis—a crisis which demands the union of the wise and brave of every description and of every denomination; that cordial union, I mean, which is most assuredly the best support, and indeed the only secure bulwark of every government upon earth. It is unnecessary to add, that an union of this kind, can be obtained only by confidence and conciliation: but, if worldly policy did not thus loudly call upon us, a principle of gratitude should lead us to pay all the attention in our power to these numerous loyal and respectable petitioners, to whom we are in a great measure indebted, for the noblest monument of wisdom and beneficence combined, which modern times have seen: I mean the union of Ireland with England, an union, which without their cordial co-operation, could never have been effected.——In reply to these observations, which appear to me to carry some weight with them; there are who maintain, that if there were no other objection the words of the Coronation Oath present an insuperable bar to the claims of the Catholics of Ireland. Of all the arguments, my lords, which either principle or prejudice has suggested, or which imagination has started, there is not one, which appears to me to rest upon so weak a foundation, as that which is built upon the words of the coronation oath. This oath, as your lordships well know, underwent some alteration at the period of the Revolution in 1688, at which period, that great prince, William the Third, entered into the following solemn Engagement when he ascended the throne of this kingdom:——"I will maintain the laws "of God, the true profession of the gospel, and the reformed protestant church "established by law; and I will preserve to "the bishops and clergy of this realm, and "to the churches committed to their charge, "all such rights and privileges as by law "do or shall appertain unto them, or to any "of them."—If, my lords, even intelligent and honest men, were not sometimes disposed to adopt any mode of reasoning, however weak, which coincides with their preconceived ideas upon a subject, it would be no easy matter to find out, upon what principle of fair construction, the words which I have just repeated from the coronation oath, can be thought to militate against the claims of the Catholics of Ireland. It will not, I trust, be said, for I am sure it cannot be proved, that it is either repugnant to the "laws of God," or, to the unconfined and benevolent tendency of the gospel, or to those liberal and enlightened principles, upon which the Reformation was founded; to admit to situations of honour, or of profit in the state, men of talents and of virtue, to whom no objection can possibly be made, but their speculative opinions of merely a religious nature; nor can I conceive in what manner "the rights and privileges of the "bishops and clergy of this realm, or of "the churches committed to their charge," can be affected by granting civil and military appointments, to men, cordially devoted to the civil constitution, and who have solemnly declared upon oath, that it is neither their intention, nor their wish, to injure or disturb the ecclesiastical. For my own part, my lords, as an individual clergyman of the church of England, sincerely attached to the established church and proud of the situation which I hold in it, I should be exceedingly sorry, if I could think for a moment, that I possessed any rights, or privileges, incompatible with the just claims of so many excellent subjects and conscientious fellow-christians. Be it however admitted, my Lords, that the words of the coronation oath, will bear the construction which has been put upon them, I wish to ask, where was the objection drawn from this oath, when, in 1782, so many indulgencies were wisely and justly granted to the catholics of Ireland? Indulgencies precisely of the same kind, though differing in degree, from those which are now petitioned for.

—But, I forbear to push this argument any further; various considerations restrain me: and perhaps enough has been said, to prove, that the words of the coronation oath, have been unadvisedly and inconclusively brought forward, during the discussion of that important question, which has engaged the attention of the public for more than three years. I will now detain your Lordships no longer: indeed, I should not have presumed to intrude so long upon your patience, had I not thought it incumbent upon me, to assign the best reasons in my power, for differing so widely from those around me, whose judgment I respect, though I cannot implicitly bow to it, against the clearest conviction of my understanding and the best feelings of my heart."

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

AMERICAN STATES.—*Mr. Rose's Ultimatum, dated Washington, March* 17, 1808.

SIR,——Being deeply impressed with the sense of his majesty's anxiety, that full effect should be given to those views of justice and moderation, by which his conduct has been regulated through the whole of the unfortunate transaction whence the present differences have arisen; and of the disappointment with which he would learn the frustration of his just and equitable purposes, I have felt it incumbent upon me, upon the receipt of the letter which you did me the honour to address to me on the 5th instant, to apply anew to this matter the most ample and serious consideration. It is with the most painful sensations of regret, that I find myself, on the result of it, under the necessity of declining to enter into the terms of negociation which, by direction of the President of the United States, you therein offer. I do not feel myself competent, in the present instance, to depart from those instructions which I stated in my letter of the 26th of Jan. last, and which preclude me from acceding to the condition thus proposed.—I should add, that I am absolutely prohibited from entering upon matters unconnected with the specific object I am authorised to discuss, much less can I thus give any pledge concerning them. The condition suggested, moreover, leads to the direct inference that the proclamation of the President of the U. States of the 3d of July, 1807, is maintained either as an equivalent for reparation for the time being, or as a compulsion to make it.—It is with the most profound regret, that I feel myself under the necessity of declaring that I am unable to act upon the terms thus proposed; as it becomes my duty to inform you, in conformity to my instructions, that on the rejection of the demand stated in my former letter, on the part of his majesty, my mission is terminated. And his majesty's government, in providing me with those instructions, did not conceive that after the declaration of his sentiments respecting the affair of the Chesapeake was made known to the government, the state of any transactions pending or unterminated between the two nations, could justify the perseverance in the enforcement of the president's proclamation. I can exercise no discretion on this point.—As on a former occasion I detailed, though minutely, the motives for that demand, on the part of his majesty, which I with so much concern learn to be deemed inadmissible by the government of the U. States; I should here abstain from any exposition of them which visibly can have no further effect upon the negociation, if I did not deem it essential that they should not be left under any misapprehension which I might be able to remove. I shall, therefore, take a short review of the transaction which has given rise to these discussions, in order the more correctly to determine the soundness of the principles upon which this demand is made.—Certain deserters from his majesty's navy, many of them his natural-born subjects, having entered into the service of the U. States, were repeatedly and fruitlessly demanded by the British officers, of the recruiting officers of the U. States; but were retained in their new service. As it was a matter of notoriety that several of these deserters were on board the frigate of the U. States, the Chesapeake, they were demanded of that frigate on the high seas, by his majesty's ship Leopard, and all knowledge of their presence on board being denied, she was attacked, and four of them, one avowedly a native Englishman, were taken out of her. Without being deterred by the consideration of how far circumstances, hostile in their nature, had provoked, though they undoubtedly by no means justified, this act of the British officer, his majesty's government directed that a positive disavowal of the rights of search asserted in this case, and of the act of the British officer, as being authorised, and a promise of reparation, should be conveyed to the American minister in London, before he had made any representation by order of the U. States.—This disavowal, made on the 2d of Aug. last, was transmitted by him to his government, before the 6th of that month; but before Mr. Munroe had received his orders to demand reparation, his majesty learnt, with what surprise it is needless to dwell upon, that the president of the U. States had interdicted, by proclamation bearing date the

2d of July, 1807, the entry of all their ports to the whole of his navy; this surprise was certainly increased, when in the letter delivered by that minister to require redress for the wrong, although it went into details unconnected with it, not only no concern was expressed on the part of the U. States, at having felt themselves compelled to enact measures of so much injury and indignity towards a friendly power, but no mention was made of the causes of such measures being resorted to, or even of the fact of their having been adopted. In addition to the embarrassment arising from these circumstances, and the insufficiency of the explanations subsequently given to Mr. Canning, the introduction of a subject foreign to that of the complaint, became the main impediment to the success of the discussion which took place in London. When I had the honour to open the negociation with you, Sir, as I had learnt that the proclamation was still in force, it became my duty, conformably to my instructions, to require its recall, as a preliminary to further discussion; had it not been in force, I was not ordered to have taken it into consideration in the adjustment of reparation; and it was considered as hardly possible that it should not have been recalled immediately upon the knowledge of his majesty's disavowal of the attack upon the Chesapeake, as an unauthorised act. But his majesty could not suffer the negociation to be carried on, in his behalf, under an interdict, which, even if justifiable in the first moments of irritation, cannot be continued after the declaration of his majesty's sentiments upon the transaction, except in the spirit of hostility.——It might have been fairly contended, that in the first instance, the exercise of an act of power, before reparation was refused or unduly protracted, was incompatible with the purposes and essence of pacific negociation, and with a demand of redress through that channel; but such have been his majesty's conciliatory views, that this argument has not been insisted on, although it might now be the more forcibly urged, as it appears that the government of the U. States was from the first sensible that, even had hostility been meditated by the British government, it would not have commenced it in such a manner. But the exception taken is to the enforcement continued up to the present time, of measures highly unfriendly in their tendency, persisted in, not only after the disavowal in question, the promise of the proffer of suitable reparation, and the renewed assurances of his majesty's amicable dispositions, but after security has been given in a public instrument bearing date of the 16th of Oct. 1807, that the claim to the seizure of deserters from the national ships of other powers, cannot again be brought forward by his majesty's naval officers, it is unnecessary to dwell upon the injury and indignity to which his majesty's service is exposed, both as touching the freedom and security of correspondence of his agents, and accredited ministers in the U. States, or as resulting from a measure, which, in time of war, excludes the whole of his navy from all their ports; which ports are completely open to the fleets of his enemies. It will be sufficient to observe, that even where exemptions from it are granted, they are made subject to such conditions, that of the three last British ships of war, which have entered these ports upon public business, two of them, his majesty's ship Statira, having on board a minister sent out for the adjustment of the present differences and a schooner bearing dispatches, in consequence of their inability to procure pilots, were obliged to enter their waters without such assistance, and were exposed to considerable danger. Great Britain, by the forms established, could repair the wrongs committed, even to the satisfaction of the U. States, no otherwise than by the channel of negociation; yet she avowed distinctly, that wrong was committed, and that she was ready to make reparation; it cannot therefore be contended, that the unavoidable delay of actual reparation subjected her to the imputation of persisting in an aggression, which was disclaimed from the first; if this is true, however much she will regret any impediment in the adjustment of a difference in which the feelings of this nation are so materially interested, can she, consistently with a due care of her own honour and interests, allow it to be concluded on her part under an adherence to a conduct, which has a decided character of enmity in the proceedings held towards her by the other party?—I know not in what view the perseverance in the president's proclamation, up to this moment, can be considered, but in that of a measure of retaliation; or of self-assumed reparation; or of a measure intended to compel reparation; unless it be that which, if I rightly understand you define it to be, a measure of precaution.—If, when a wrong is committed, retaliation is instantly resorted to by the injured party, the door to pacific adjustment is closed, and the means of reconciliation precluded. The right to demand reparation is incompatible with the assumption of it.—When parties are in a state of mutual hostility, they are so far on a footing, and as such they may treat. But a party dis-

claiming every unfriendly intention and giving unequivocal proofs of an amicable disposition, cannot be expected to treat with another, whose conduct towards it has the direct effects of actual hostility. If then, the enforcement of the president's proclamation, up to the present moment, is a measure of self-assumed reparation, it is directly repugnant to the spirit and fact of amicable negociation; if it is a measure to compel reparation, it is equally so; and by the perseverance in it, G. Britain is dispensed with the duty of proffering redress. But if it is a measure of precaution, in order to secure reparation, or in order to compel it, it falls under the objections I have stated. If it is a precaution adopted as a guard against acts of violence apprehended on the part of his majesty's naval officers, it surely cannot be considered as being as effectual a security as that arising from the renewed assurances of his majesty's friendly disposition, which imply a due observance of the rights of nations with which Great Britain is in amity, by all persons holding authority under his majesty's government from the disavowal of the pretension of the search of national ships, and from the further assurance of that disavowal, given in his majesty's proclamation of the 16th of Oct. last. Neither under these concurrent circumstances can the plea of necessity be maintained; and if such a proceeding has not the plea of necessity, it assumes the character of aggression. If these concurrent securities against such an apprehension have any value, the necessity no longer exists; if they have no value, negociation cannot be attempted, as the basis upon which rests the mutual confidence of the two parties would be wholly wanting.—From the moment after the unfortunate affair of the Chesapeake, that his majesty's naval commanders in these waters had ascertained that they were safe from the effervescences of that popular fury under which the most glaring outrages were committed, and by which they were naturally led to the supposition that they were objects of particular hostility, and that a state of war against them, requiring precautions on their part, had commenced, no conduct has been imputed to them, which could vindicate the necessity of maintaining in force the president's proclamation.—Since that time such of those officers as have been necessitated by the circumstances of the war to remain in these waters, have held no communication with the shore, except in an instance too trifling to dwell upon, and instantly disavowed by the commanding officer; and they have acquiesced quietly in various privations, highly prejudicial to the service they were upon, and in consequence of an interdict, which had they been regardless of their duties towards a state in amity with their sovereign, and had they not carefully repressed the feelings its tone and language had a direct tendency to provoke in them, would have rather excited than averted the evils it was stated to be intended to prevent; were they regardful of these duties, it was unnecessary. Had they felt themselves obliged completely to evacuate the waters of the U. States, especially while an enemy's squadron was harboured in them, they could have done it; but under the admission of hostile compulsion, and under such compulsion carried into full effect, his majesty could not have dissembled the extent of the injury received.—In the several cases adduced, in which G. Britain required certain preliminaries, previously to entering into negociation, she regulated her conduct by the same principles to which she now adheres; and refused, whilst no hostility was exhibited on her part, to treat with powers, whose proceedings denoted it towards her; and who maintained their right in what they had assumed.——From the consideration thus afforded, I trust that neither the order of reason, or that of usage, are in contradiction to the demand I have urged, nor am I aware how the order of time opposes the revocation in the first instance of that act, which affects injuriously one of the parties, and is still avowed by the other.—The subject is thus presented to you, Sir, in the light in which it was natural that it should offer itself to his majesty's government. It certainly conceived the president's proclamation to rest chiefly and most materially upon the attack made upon the frigate of the U. States, the Chesapeake, by his majesty's ship Leopard, although other topics were adduced as accessaries. In this apprehension it may be held to have been sufficiently warranted by the precise time at which, and the circumstances under which it was issued, and by its whole context; and the more so as the impulse under which, it was drawn up appears to have been so sudden as to have precluded a due examination of all the grounds of allegation contained in it. And here I beg leave to assure you, that with respect to the spirit and tone of that instrument, it would be highly satisfactory to me, if I could feel myself justified in expressing, on the part of his majesty, any degree of coincidence with the opinions you have announced, or when thus appealed to, and making every allowance for the irritation of the moment, I could dissemble the extreme surprise experienced by G. Britain that the government of a friendly na-

tion, even before an amicable demand of reparation was made, and yet meaning to make that demand, should have issued an edict, directing measures of injury very disproportionate to what it knew was an unauthorised offence, and both in its terms and its purport so injurious to the government to which that demand was to be addressed, and tending to call forth in both nations the feelings under which a friendly adjustment would be the most difficult. But if, as I learn from you, Sir, the proclamation rests substantially upon other causes, it is then peculiarly to be regretted, that, together with the demand for redress made in Sept. last, the government of the U. States did not think fit to offer a negociation or an explanation of so momentous a measure, or to declare that its recall must be more or less connected with the adjustment of other alledged wrongs. Neither did it think necessary to return any answer to the remonstrance given in by his majesty's envoy at Washington, on the 13th July, 1807, in which he represented "that he considered that interdiction to be so unfriendly in its object, and so injurious in its consequences to his majesty's interests, that he could not refrain from expressing the most sincere regret, that it ever should have been issued, and most earnestly deprecating its being enforced."——It could not be supposed that a circumstance of so great weight could be overlooked by his majesty's government, in determining the line of conduct to be held in the negociation; and as little could it be expected to pass it over, when on the failure of the discussion with Mr. Munroe, it directed a special mission to be sent to the U. States. It had the less reason to imagine that any other grievances could be connected with that, for the adjustment of which I am empowered to negociate, as Mr. Munroe in his letter to Mr. Canning of the 29th of July last, had stated with respect to other subjects of remonstrance, that it was improper to mingle them with the present more serious cause of complaint; an opinion towhich M.Canning declared his perfect assent in his letter to that minister of the 2d of the subsequent month; so that this act was left as single and distinct, to be singly and distinctly considered. His majesty's government therefore could not, consistently with any view of the subject then before it, or indeed with the just object of my mission, direct or empower me to enter upon matters not connected with that of the Chesapeake; and they could with the less propriety do it, as in order to render the adjustment of differences of such a nature the more easy and the more conspicuous, the ministers charged especially with such offices, have been, with few exceptions, restricted to the precise affair to be negociated. With respect therefore to those other causes of complaint, upon which you inform me that the president's proclamation rests, I cannot be furnished with documents enabling me either to admit or to controvert those statements of grievance, foreign to the attack upon that ship, contained in your letter, or authorized to discuss the matters themselves. I shall therefore not allow myself to offer such comments as my personal knowledge of some of those transactions suggest to me, although their tendency would materially affect both the marked manner in which these transactions are portrayed, and the disadvantageous lights in which his majesty's government is represented to have acted respecting them.——I am moreover led to the persuasion that my government will be the more easily able to rescue itself from inculpation by the inferences arising from passages in Mr. Munroe's letters to Mr. Secretary Canning, of the 29th of Sept. last, that the differences unhappily subsisting between the two nations were in a train of adjustment.——If his majesty has not permitted me to enter into the discussion of the search of neutral merchant ships for British seamen, together with the adjustment of the amount of reparation for the attack upon the Chesapeake, it was in no wise with a view of precluding the further agitation of that question at a suitable time; but it was that the negociation might be relieved from the embarrassment arising from the connexion of the present matter with the one so foreign to it, and as it was but too well known, so difficult to be adjusted, of a right distinctly disclaimed, with one which G. Britain has at all time asserted, of enforcing her claim to the services of her natural-born subjects, when found on board merchant vessels of other nations; a claim which she founds in that principle of universal law, which gives to the state the right of requiring the aid and assistance of her native citizens. The recurrence, therefore, to that course of negociation, which had been originally settled between Mr. Secretary Canning and Mr.Monroe, and which had alone been broken in upon by the orders subsequently received by that minister, can only be considered as a resumption of that course of things which G. Britain strenuously contended there was no ground to depart from. I may observe that this purpose might have been effected without the intervention of a special minister.—It will be in your recollection, Sir, that in our first interview, I stated the condition which makes the subject of the present let-

ter, before I was informed by you that the president of the U. States would consent to the separation of the two subjects.—I had trusted that the exposition which I added to my letter of the 25th of Jan., to the verbal explanation I had before offered, of the grounds of his majesty's demand, was both in its purport, and in the terms in which it was couched, such as to prevent a suspicion that they were in their intention derogatory to the honour, or calculated to wound the just sensibility of the nation. I may add, that such a supposition could not be reconciled with the various ostensible and unequivocal demonstrations of his majesty's good faith and anxiety, that this transaction should be brought to an amicable termination, which were exhibited even prior to any remonstrances on the part, or by order of this government. The other topics which I felt myself authorized to advance in that letter, in illustration of that amicable disposition on the part of the king, were brought forward from the conviction I entertained that they must be of a nature to be satisfactory to this government, and therefore such as it was particularly my duty to enforce, but not with a view to rest upon them the right to advance the claim which I have stated. — I may here remark, it is obvious that far from requiring that the first step towards an arrangement of reparation should be taken by the U. States, G. Britain has already made them openly and distinctly: they are indubitable testimonies to the respect borne and decidedly marked by G. Britain, to the ties of amity subsisting between the two nations, and of her cordial desire to maintain them unimpaired: and as such alone they were urged.—As his majesty would have derived sincere satisfaction from the evidence of corresponding feelings on the part of the U. States, so it would be the more painful for me to dwell upon a series of insults and menaces, which without any provocation or warlike preparation on the part of G. Britain, have been for months accumulated upon her through the U. States, and but too frequently from quarters whose authority necessarily and powerfullycommanded attention.—I ought perhaps to apologize for adverting to an incidental expression in your letter, if I did not think it right to remove any ambiguity respecting the nature of the claim which G. Britain maintained to her seamen, native citizens of the realm, who have deserted from her service to that of other powers: it is, that on demand they shall be discharged forthwith, and consequently, they shall instantly be freed from their newly contracted obligations.—Before I close this letter, allow me to state to you, Sir, that I have felt it my duty to transmit to his majesty's government, the exposition contained in your letter of the 5th inst of the various demands on the honour and good faith of G. Britain, on which the complaint is made, that satisfaction has not been afforded to the U. States, and on which, conjointly with the affair of the Chesapeake, you informed me that the proclamation of the president of the U. States of the 2d of July, 1807, is founded. It will be for his majesty's government to determine, on the part of G. Britain, whether any and what obligations remain to be fulfilled by her—whether any denial or such protraction of redress have occurred on her part, as to render necessary or justifiable the perseverance in an edict, which, when not necessary or justifiable, assumes a character of aggression? And whether on the result of these considerations, the present negociation can be resumed on the part of his majesty, with a due regard for his own honour, or with a prospect of a more successful termination.——I have the honour to be, &c. (Signed) G. H. Rose.

France and America.——*Letter of M. Champagny, to Gen. Armstrong, dated Paris, Jan.* 15, 1808.

Sir,——The different notes which you have done me the honour to address to me have been laid before his Majesty.——The proceedings of England towards all governments are so contrary to the law of nations, and to all the rules constantly observed even among enemies, that no recourse against this power is any longer to be found in the ordinary means of repression. In order to annoy her, it is become necessary to turn against her the arms which she makes use of herself; and if transient inconveniences result therefrom, it is to her alone they are to be imputed. Since England respects no laws, how could they be respected with regard to her? The maritime laws which she violates, ought they still to be a protection to her? And if some powers tolerate the infractions committed on their independence, could they have the right to require, that France alone should restrain herself within limits which her enemy has every where overleaped?—The United States, more than any other power, have to complain of the aggressions of England.

(To be continued.)

Printed by Cox and Baylis, Great Queen Street; published by R. Bagshaw, Brydges Street, Covent-Garden, where former Numbers may be had, sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.